# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/855,885 | 05/15/2001 | Gil Lemel | 451/65084 | 1481 |

| | |
|---|---|
| 7590        07/13/2005 | **EXAMINER** |
| RICHARD F. JAWORSKI | NGUYEN, KEVIN M |
| Cooper & Dunham LLP | |
| 1185 Avenue of the Americas | |
| New York, NY  10036 | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2674 | |

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>29 October 2004</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**      2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-33* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-33* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☒ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

   1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/20/2003</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

## DETAILED ACTION

1.      This Office Action is made in response to applicant's RESPONSE TO

RESTRICTION/ELECTION REQUIREMENT, filed October 29, 2004, the restriction

mailed 09/30/2004 is withdrawn. The Office Action is provided as follow:

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.      <u>Claims 1-4, 14, 19, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being</u>

<u>unpatentable over Kobayashi (US 6,686,908) in view of Grant et al (US 6,618,039).</u>

3.      As to claims 1 and 4, Kobayashi teaches a system associated with a method for

the secure access of the information terminal device which includes a key input device 1

(a dedicated keyboard, fig. 1, col. 5, lines 54-58) associated with a dedicated IC card 2.

a.      An URL address of a home page corresponding to the card and an

identification code (identification means) therein (col. 6, lines 57-59);

b.      Automatic URL calling means defined by the securities card 50 is

composed of an IC card, and an inner memory thereof stores therein an URL

address and a key assignment program as shown in Fig. 9. The URL is address

for opening a home page of the securities company corresponding to this

securities card 50 (col. 7, lines 12-18);

said system further comprising one or more web pages (home page of a department store A or home page of a shop B or home page of a company C, see col. 6, lines 35-38). Thus, the information terminal device 30 (fig. 7) inherently includes a Netscape Navigator and Microsoft's Internet Explorer (a browser) to access the World Wide Web from said home pages being started.

Accordingly, Kobayashi teaches all of the claimed limitations of claim 1, except for dedicated keyboard.

However, Grant et al teaches a system which includes a navigated keypad 30 (fig. 1, col. 4, lines 38-44).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide Kobayashi's system including the navigated keypad 30, in view of the teaching in the Grant's reference, because this would permit the user of full-screen viewing of web page content and easier intuitive control of browser functions as taught by Grant et al (col. 6, lines 53-55).

4.      As to claim 2, Kobayashi teaches the URL calling means defined by the CPU 38 (a hardware) send the URL address through the transmit-receive portion 43 to the Internet 44 (col. 7, lines 5-6).

5.      As to claim 3, Kobayashi teaches the URL calling means defined by the CPU 38 reads out a program (a software) corresponding to the received identification code fro the ROM 39 (col. 7, lines 2-3).

6.      As to claim 14, Kobayashi teaches the keyboard 32 (dedicated keyboard, fig. 7) comprising an identifying code  (IC card 2, fig. 2), server 45 (fig. 7), and the Internet 44 (fig. 7).

7.      As to claims 19 and 20, Kobayashi teaches a system for the navigation and accession of web pages (home page of a department store A or home page of a shop B or home page of a company C, a hyperlinked documents as claimed, see col. 6, lines 35-38) which includes a computer 30 (fig. 7), a display screen 33 (fig. 7), a dedicated keyboard 32 (fig. 7, col. 6, lines 6-13).

Accordingly, Kobayashi teaches all of the claimed limitations of claim 1, except for dedicated keyboard comprise keys shaped in the form of icons and or symbols.

However, Grant et al teaches a system that includes a navigated keypad 30 that includes keys shaped in the form of icons and or symbols (see details in fig. 5, col. 6, lines 1-33).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide Kobayashi's system including the navigated keypad 30 having keys shaped in the form of icons and or symbols, in view of the teaching in the Grant's reference, because this would permit the user of full-screen viewing of web page content and easier intuitive control of browser functions as taught by Grant et al (col. 6, lines 53-55).

8.      As to claim 21, Kobayashi teaches the key input device 1 as described above can be widely utilized as a portable telephone (col. 5, lines 54-58) via the Internet 44 (fig. 7, col. 6, lines 6-13).

9.      Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Kobayashi (US 6,686,908) in view of Grant et al (US 6,618,039), and further in view of

Becker et al (US 6,195,085).

As to claim 22, the combination of Kobayashi and Grant et al teaches all of the

limitations of claim 20, except for the keys is changed utilizing key covers.

However, Becker teaches a related input device which the buttons can be coated

with liquid crystal such that the buttons change color when "clicked" (see col. 11, lines

32-34).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to modify Kobayashi's and Grant's keyboard including the buttons which

can be coated with liquid crystal such that the buttons change color when "clicked", in

view of the teaching in the Becker et al's reference, because this would improve

information-retrieval apparatus utilized in association with a graphical user interface as

taught by Becker et al (col. 2, lines 55-57), in addition, the apparatus described herein

may be applied to keyboard keys as taught by Becker et al (col. 11, lines 35-41).

10.     Claim 18 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Grant et al in view of Kim (US 5,892,503).

11.     As to claim 18, Grant et al teach a translator 44 (an arbitration device) associated

with a CPU for selecting the keyboard 10 (fig. 1) which includes

selector modes (surfpad mode for dedicated keyboard 30, see details in col. 7,

lines 43-50);

the translator 44 which is connected to the first communicating wire 42 and the

second communicating wire 46 (fig. 2, col. 4, lines 38-49) that defined the I/O ports as

claimed.

a conventional keyboard 10 (fig. 1) inherently includes a serial I/O port.

Accordingly, Grant et al teach all of the claimed limitations of claim 18, except for

a parallel to serial converter, one or more I/O serial ports, and one or more parallel I/O

ports of a dedicated keyboard device.

However, Kim teaches a related keyboard which includes the left connector 132

comprising enhanced PS/2 compatible communication connectors (fig. 1, col. 5, lines

37-39), the serial input 388, and the serial input 389 (fig. 7, see details in col. 13, lines

1-19), the parallel input, and the parallel output (fig. 7, see details in col. 13, lines 1-19).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify

I/O port of keypad 30 of Grant et al including enhanced PS/2 compatible communication

connectors having the parallel input, the parallel output, the serial input 388, the serial

input 389, in view of the teaching in the Kim's reference, because this would allow for

digital interfaces between the keyboard and the computer system for increasing

reliability as taught by Kim (col. 1, lines 44-45).

12.     As to claim 23, Grant et al teach a system for the navigation and accession of

web pages (fig. 2) which includes a browser terminal 40 (a computer, fig. 2), inherently

a display screen (fig. 2), a dedicated keyboard 30 (fig. 2, col. 4, lines 28-35), a translator

44 (a arbitration device as claimed, fig. 2), a selector modes (surfpad mode for

dedicated keyboard 30, see details in col. 7, lines 43-50), and a navigated keypad 30

includes keys shaped in the form of icons and or symbols (see details in fig. 5, col. 6,

lines 1-33).

Accordingly, Grant et al et al teach all the subject matters claimed except for the

dedicated keyboard with a parallel-to-serial converting device (P/S port).

However, Kim teaches a related keyboard which includes the left connector 132

comprising enhanced PS/2 compatible communication connectors (fig. 1, col. 5, lines

37-39), the parallel input, the parallel output, the serial input 388, and the serial input

389 (fig. 7, see details in col. 13, lines 1-19).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify

I/O port of keypad 30 of Grant et al including enhanced PS/2 compatible communication

connectors having the parallel input, the parallel output, the serial input 388, the serial

input 389, in view of the teaching in the Kim's reference, because this would allow for

digital interfaces between the keyboard and the computer system for increasing

reliability as taught by Kim (col. 1, lines 44-45).

13.     Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Kobayashi in view of Grant et al, and further in view of Inala et al (US Pub.

2003/0187925).

As to claim 5, the combination of Kobayashi and Grant teach all of the claimed

limitations of claim 4, except for "means to allow a user of the system to interact with

another user of the system the identifying code of whose keyboard he knows."

However, Inala et al teach a related method for using in response to private chat invitations, instant messenger (identifying code), and other communication attempts initiated by other session participants (paragraph [0258]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Kobayashi's and Grant's software including using in response to private chat invitations, instant messenger (identifying code), and other communication attempts initiated by other session participants, in view of the teaching in the Inala et al's reference, because this would provide a method for responding to such requests in a way that other participants remain unaware that user is being represented by proxy as taught by Inala et al (paragraph [0258]).

14. Claims 6-8, 13, 15-17 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grant et al in view of Inala et al.

15. As to claim 6, Grant et al teach a system computer (fig. 2) associated with a method, the system computer comprising the translator box 42, fig. 2, (inherently includes an I/O ports), a navigated keypad 30 (a dedicated keyboard, fig. 2) having the control group of keys 58 (each key is marked or shaped, fig. 5, see details in col. 5, lines 45-60) and the navigating group of keys 62 (fig. 5, see details in col. 6, lines 1-33) which are designated their purpose and/or function.

Grant et al further teach at least a "back" button may take the user back to the previous "web page' that was viewed during a particular session (col. 6, lines 10-11) that meet the limitation 6 (d) interacting with said hyperlinked document applications through said dedicated keyboard device.

Accordingly, Grant et al teach all of the claimed limitations of claim 6, except for "(a) providing a <u>parser</u> for hyperlinked document applications, (b) providing hyperlinked document applications which comprises key accession events."

However, Inala et al teach a parsing engine 87 is provided and adapted to <u>parse</u> individual WEB sites according to a template created via scripting module 79 (see paragraph [0100]) that meet the claimed limitation of 6a). A communication interface/browser control module 85 is provided and adapted to function as a WEB browser to access WEB sites containing WEB data (see paragraph [0099]) that meet the claimed limitation of 6b). Thus, the WEB browser which is a Netscape Navigator includes at least one "back" button (key) to access the events as claimed.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Grant's software including the parser 87 and Amazon.com (hyperlinked document application, see [0103]), in view of the teaching in the Inala et al, because this would reduce complication in the case of many scripts on one template as taught by Inala et al (two last line of [0103]).

16.　As to claim 7, Grant et al teach the keypad 30 (the dedicated keyboard, fig. 5) is disbursed a plurality of button 50. These buttons 50 are in a variety of forms, including keys or buttons, touchpad or other touch-sensitive switches (fig. 5, col. 4, lines 57-60).

17.　As to claim 8, Grant et al teach a standard keyboard 10 (fig. 1).

18.　As to claim 13, Inala et al teach Internet appliance 17 (a computer system, fig. 1) connecting to the network/internet 13 (fig. 1, see [0052]), and the member web pages

33 (the hyperlinked document applicant, fig. 2) storing on the server 31 (fig. 2, see

[0056]) connecting to said network/internet 13.

19. As to claims 15 and 16, Inala et al teach SGML (see [0142]), and HTML (see

[0141]).

20. As to claims 17 and 33, Grant et al teach a system computer (fig. 2) associated

with a method, the system computer comprising at least one "back" button may take the

user back to the previous "web page' that was viewed during a particular session (col. 6,

lines 10-11) that meet the limitation 17 a) which is detected by the translator box 42, fig.

2, inherent includes a I/O ports, as modified by Inala et al teaching SGML (see [0142]),

and HTML (see [0141]) via the server 31 (fig. 2, see [0056]) connecting to said

network/internet 13 that meet the limitation 17 a.1) and 17 a. 2).

21. Claims 25-27, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Grant et al in view of Inala et al, and further in view of Kobayashi.

As to claims 25-27, 32 and 33, the combination of Grant et al and Inala et al

teaches all of the limitations of claim 6, except for the dedicated keyboard comprising

identifying code.

However, Kobayashi teaches the keyboard 32 (dedicated keyboard, fig. 7)

comprising an identifying code (IC card 2, fig. 2), server 45 (fig. 7), and the Internet 44

(fig. 7).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to modify each Grant's and Inala's keyboard keys including the identifying

code, in view of the teaching in the Kobayashi's reference, because this would allow a

user to open a home page of the securities company corresponding to this securities

card as taught by Kobayashi (col. 7, lines 15-16).

22.     Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Grant et al in view of Inala et al, and further in view of Kim (US 5,892,503).

23.     As to claim 9, the combination of Grant et al and Inala et al teaches all the

subject matter claimed except for the dedicated keyboard with a parallel-to-serial

converting device (P/S port) .

However, Kim teaches a related keyboard which includes the left connector 132

comprising enhanced PS/2 compatible communication connectors (fig. 1, col. 5, lines

37-39), having bidirectional I/O pins (fig. 2, see details in col. 7, lines 1-8).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify

I/O port of keypad 30 of Grant et al including enhanced PS/2 compatible communication

connectors having bidirectional I/O pins, in view of the teaching in the Kim's reference,

because this would allow for digital interfaces between the keyboard and the computer

system for increasing reliability as taught by Kim (col. 1, lines 44-45).

24.     As to claim 10, Grant et al review particularly when the user must switch to the

keyboard to select "hot key" (see col. 2, lines 24-25).

25.     As to claim 11, Grant et al teach the keypad 30 (the dedicated keyboard as

claimed, fig. 2) having a translator 44 (a arbitration device, fig. 2), as modified by Kim

teaches the keyboard having PS/2 172 (fig. 3), the parallel input, the parallel output (fig.

7, see details in col. 13, lines 1-19) which performs the function of converting the data

from parallel into serial stream of bits.

26.     As to claim 12, Grant et al teach the keypad 30 (the dedicated keyboard as

claimed, fig. 2) having a translator 44 (a arbitration device, fig. 2), as modified by Kim

teaches the keyboard 100 (fig. 1) having PS/2 172 (fig. 3), the serial input 388, and the

serial input 389 (fig. 7, see details in col. 13, lines 1-19).

27.     Claims 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Grant et al in view of Inala et al in view of Kim, and further in view of Kobayashi.

        As to claims 28-31, the combination of Grant et al, Inala et al and Kim teaches all

of the limitations of claim 6, except for the dedicated keyboard comprising identifying

code.

        However, Kobayashi teaches the keyboard 32 (dedicated keyboard, fig. 7)

comprising an identifying code  (IC card 2, fig. 2), server 45 (fig. 7), and the Internet 44

(fig. 7).

        It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to modify each Grant's, Inala's, and Kim's keyboard keys including the

identifying code, in view of the teaching in the Kobayashi's reference, because this

would allow a user to open a home page of the securities company corresponding to

this securities card as taught by Kobayashi (col. 7, lines 15-16).

### *Conclusion*

28.     Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Kevin M. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-

7697. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-THU from 8:00-6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Patrick N. Edouard can be reached on 571-272-7603. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-

872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the Patent Application Information Retrieval system, see

http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair. Should you have questions on access to the

Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197

(toll-free).

<div style="text-align:right">
Kevin M. Nguyen<br>
Patent Examiner<br>
Art Unit 2674
</div>

KMN
July 7, 2005

PATRICK N. EDOUARD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER